

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the present application. The final Office Action dated October 23, 2003 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

By this Response, Applicants have amended claims 1, 2, 4-9 and 15. All changes are supported by the originally filed specification. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-22 are pending in the application with claims 10-14 being withdrawn from consideration. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection and rejections in view of the above amendments and the following remarks are requested.

In the Office Action, claim 8 is objected to because of an informality. Applicants have amended claim 8. Accordingly, the objection is overcome. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph , as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants have amended the claims to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-5, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,926,235, issued to Han et al (hereafter “Han”). Applicants traverse the rejection because Han fails to teach or suggest each of the features recited in the claims of the present application. In particular, Han fails to teach or suggest a liquid crystal display device that includes, among other features, “a first protective layer formed between the storage electrode and the pixel electrode at a central portion of an overlapping area between the storage electrode and the pixel electrode, wherein the storage electrode is directly connected to the pixel electrode at an edge portion of the overlapping area” as recited in claim 1 of the present application.

Han discloses “a method for fabricating an active matrix liquid crystal display having a minimal number of masking steps” and “a reduced number of rubber defects” (col. 2, lines 41-46). The Han invention includes a first passivation layer that covers the storage capacitors, the drain electrodes, the semiconductor layer, the source bus lines and source electrodes; and a second passivation layer that covers the first passivation layer and the substrate (see, Abstract and FIG. 5E). However, as depicted in FIG. 5I of Han, the pixel electrode 104, storage capacitor 130 and first and second passivation layers 113a and 113b, fail to fulfill the requirements recited in claim 1. Specifically, Han does not teach or suggest “a first protective layer formed between the storage electrode and the pixel electrode at a central portion of an overlapping area between the storage electrode and the pixel electrode, wherein the storage electrode is directly connected to the pixel electrode at an edge portion of the overlapping area” as recited in independent claim 1. As such, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-5 and 20-21 are patentable over Han.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are requested.

In the Office Action, claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,982,467, issued to Lee. Applicants traverse the rejection because Lee fails to teach or suggest each of the features recited in the claims of the present application. In particular, Lee fails to teach or suggest a liquid crystal display device including, among other features, “the pixel electrode covering an upper surface and each side edge of the storage electrode, wherein the storage electrode is directly connected to the pixel electrode at an end of an overlapping area between the storage electrode and the pixel electrode” as recited in independent claim 6.

Lee discloses a method of manufacturing an active panel of an active matrix liquid crystal display (AMLCD) (col. 1, lines 11-16). In Lee, “the pixel electrodes 139 are connected with the drain electrode 137 through the drain contact hole 171 and connected with the storage capacitor electrode 119 through the storage capacitor contact hole 175” (col. 6, lines 43-46). However, as depicted in FIG. 4F, Lee does not teach “the pixel electrode covering an upper surface and each side edge of the storage electrode, wherein the storage electrode is directly connected to the pixel electrode at an end of an overlapping area between the storage electrode and the pixel electrode” as recited in independent claim 6. Because Lee fails to teach each of the

features recited in claim 6, claim 6 and its dependent claims 7-9 are patentable over Lee. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are requested.

In the Office Action, claims 15-19 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Related Art. Applicants traverse the rejection because the Related Art fails to teach or suggest a liquid crystal display device that includes, among other features, “a first protective layer patterned on a central portion of an overlapping area of the storage electrode between the storage electrode and the pixel electrode, wherein the pixel electrode directly connects to the storage electrode at an edge portion of the overlapping area between the storage electrode and the pixel electrode” as recited in independent claim 15.

As illustrated in FIG. 2 of the Related Art, the pixel electrode 22 contacts the storage electrode 30 via contact hole 20b. The Related Art fails to teach or suggest “the pixel electrode directly connects to the storage electrode at an edge portion of the overlapping area between the storage electrode and the pixel electrode” as recited in claim 15. Because the Related Art fails to teach or suggest each of the features recited in claim 15, independent claim 15 and its dependent claims 16-19 and 22 are patentable over the Related Art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are requested.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If the Examiner deems that a telephone conversation would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned (202) 496-7500.

Application No.: 10/026,961
Amendment dated January 12, 2004
Reply to Office Action dated October 23, 2003

Docket No.: 8733.524.00-US

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: January 12, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie Hayes
Valerie Hayes

Registration No.: 53,005
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant

Application No.: 10/026,961
Amendment dated January 12, 2004
Reply to Office Action dated October 23, 2003

Docket No.: 8733.524.00-US

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: January 12, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie Hayes
Valerie Hayes

Registration No.: 53,005
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant